



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,090	01/20/2004	David Eugene Huddleston	063170.6951	4604
5073	7590	03/24/2008		
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			EXAMINER FREJD, RUSSELL WARREN	
			ART UNIT 2128	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 03/24/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com  
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/762,090	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HUDDLESTON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Russell Frejd	<b>Art Unit</b> 2128	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7 and 8 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3,6,8,9,11 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

***Examination of Application #10/762,090***

1. Claims 1-12 of application 10/762,090, filed on 20-January-2004, are pending in the application. This application is a CON of 10/412,993, filed on 14-April-2003, now abandoned. Claims 13-15 are canceled.

***Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101***

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

- 2.1 Claims 3, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The invention claims an adaptive system modeling method.

- 2.2 This claimed subject matter lacks a practical application of a judicial exception (law of nature, abstract idea, naturally occurring article/phenomenon) since it fails to: 1) physically transform or reduce an article to a different state or thing; or 2) having the **final result** (not the steps) achieve or produce a: useful (specific, substantial, AND credible utility), concrete (assured, substantially repeatable/non-unpredictable), **and** tangible (real world/non-abstract, enabling usefulness to be realized) result. The Courts have found that subject matter that is not a practical application or use of an idea, a law of nature or a natural phenomenon is not patentable. As the Supreme Court has made clear, “[a]n idea of itself is not patentable,” *Rubber-Tip Pencil Co. v. Howard*, 20 U.S. (1 Wall.) 498, 507 (1874); taking several abstract ideas and manipulating them together adds nothing to the basic equation. In re Warmerdam, 31 USPQ2d 1754 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

The courts have also held that a claim may not preempt ideas, laws of nature or natural phenomena. The concern over preemption was expressed as early as 1852. See Le Roy v. Tatham, 55 U.S. (14 How.) 156, 175 (1852) (“A principle, in the abstract, is a fundamental truth; an original cause; a motive; these cannot be patented, as no one can claim in either of them an

Art Unit: 2128

exclusive right.”); Funk Bros. Seed Co. v. Kalo Inoculant Co., 333 U.S. 127, 132, 76 USPQ 280, 282 (1948).

Accordingly, one may not patent every “substantial practical application” of an idea, law of nature or natural phenomena because such a patent “in practical effect would be a patent on the [idea, law of nature or natural phenomena] itself.” Here the “*method*” claims are so abstract, so as to appear to: a) preempt any practical application of the abstract idea; and b) be so sweeping as to cover both known and unknown uses of:

**Claims 3, 8 and 11:** determining a baseline significance signature of current behavior of a system by performing a discriminant analysis;

selecting from a plurality of candidate features a set of input features and a superset of the input features and other features by using the baseline significance signature;

generating a system model by using data corresponding to the selected input features set; and

maintaining online data corresponding to the superset of the input features and other features collected from the system.

**Claims 6, 9 and 12:** determining a baseline significance signature of current behavior of a system by using a decision tree methodology to perform a discriminant analysis;

selecting from a plurality of candidate features of a system a set of input features by using the baseline significance signature; and

generating a system model by using data corresponding to the selected input features set.

***Remarks***

3. Applicant's remarks in the amendment received 12-December-2007 were directed solely at claim 1, and included no discussion in regard to the claims as noted above, which are uniquely separate in scope from claim 1. For example, none of these claims are directed to detecting an evolutionary change in the system. For this reason, the 101 rejections of these claims is maintained.

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claims 4 and 5 are objected to for being dependent on a rejected base claim.

### ***Allowed Claims***

5. Claims 1-15 are deemed allowable over the prior art of record at this time, pending resolution of any rejections noted above, because the prior art does not specifically teach the claimed adaptive system modeling method.

### ***Response Guidelines***

6. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see MPEP 710.02, 710.02(b)).

#### **6.1 Any response to the Examiner in regard to this non-final action should be**

**directed to:** Russell Frejd, telephone number (571) 272-3779, Monday-Friday from 0530 to 1400 ET, **or** the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah, telephone number (571) 272-2279. Inquires of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100 Group Receptionist (571) 272-2100.

**mailed to:** Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**or faxed to:** (571) 273-8300

Application/Control Number: 10/762,090  
Art Unit: 2128

Page 5

**Date:** 16-March-2008

/Russell Freid/  
Primary Examiner AU 2128